Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Hybrid Ant Colony Optimization in solving Multi–Skill Resource–Constrained Project Scheduling Problem

Paweł B. Myszkowski · Marek E. Skowroński · Łukasz P. Olech · Krzysztof Oślizło

arXiv:1603.08538v2 [cs.NE] 31 Mar 2016

the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later

Abstract In this paper Hybrid Ant Colony Optimization (HAntCO) approach in solving Multi–Skill Resource Constrained Project Scheduling Problem (MS–RCPSP) has been presented. We have proposed hybrid approach that links classical heuristic priority rules for project scheduling with Ant Colony Optimization (ACO). Furthermore, a novel approach for updating pheromone value has been proposed, based on both the best and worst solutions stored by ants. The objective of this paper is to research the usability and robustness of ACO and its hybrids with priority rules in solving MS–RCPSP. Experiments have been performed using artificially created dataset instances, based on real–world ones. We published those instances that can be used as a benchmark. Presented results show that ACO–based hybrid method is an efficient approach. More directed search process by hybrids makes this approach more stable and provides mostly better results than classical ACO.

Keywords ant colony optimization · project scheduling problem · metaheuristics · hybrid ACO · multi objective optimization · benchmark dataset

1 Introduction

Resource–Constrained Project Scheduling Problem (RCPSP) is one of the most investigated types of scheduling problems. Its goal is to find the resource–to–task assignments to make the finite project plan the cheapest or shortest. Description of RCPSP in (Blazewicz et al., 1983) as combinatorial, NP–hard problem encouraged scientists to find *good enough* methods that would be able to produce approximate, (sub)optimal solutions in finite, polynomial computing time. Those methods are called (meta)heuristics and are used to solve problems for which finding optimal solution in an acceptable time is impossible.

Beside Evolutionary Algorithms (EA), Taboo Search (TS), Simulated Annealing (SA) and some other techniques, metaheuristics contain also a group of methods called *swarm–intelligence* methods, as Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) or Ant Colony Optimization (ACO). Those methods assume that separate individuals, representing given problem solutions, can interact with each other and cooperate to achieve their common goals. In this point of view, swarm intelligence techniques are similar to EA. However, they assume that there is one, constant population of individuals that can evolve in time but cannot be replaced by new individuals. ACO, as the name stands, simulates the behaviour of ants, travelling between the ant's nest and the source of food. The optimization goal is to find the optimal path between food and nest, while definition of *path's quality* is varied and dependent on the considered problem.

The *real–life* nature of RCPSP comes from business. Project managers in companies struggle to build effective project schedule, meeting duration, cost and other constraints. What is more, many constraints have to be satisfied, while manual scheduling often leads to violating of those constraints. It is a common problem for project managers. Hence computer–aided, (semi–)automatic tools are desired by the industry. Furthermore, obtaining the project plan by computer–driven methods is less time–consuming than obtained manually.

Department of Artificial Intelligence, Wroclaw University of Technology, E-mail: {pawel.myszkowski, m.e.skowronski}@pwr.wroc.pl, {179214, 163753}@student.pwr.wroc.pl

Developing RCPSP to a more practical problem, we have introduced the skills domain, transforming it to the Multi–Skill RCPSP (MS–RCPSP) extension. In MS–RCPSP resources dispose of some given pool of skills, while every task requires some skill in a given level to be performed. It means not every resource is capable of performing every task. As solution space in MS–RCPSP is more constrained, it is more difficult to build *good enough* solution – project schedule. Furthermore, we have added another criterion – project schedule performance cost, transforming the classical single–objective (duration) RCPSP into multi–objective (duration vs. cost) MS–RCPSP.

We have decided to create hybrid methods by combining ACO–based approach with some heuristics described in (Skowroński et al., 2013b). Therefore, classical heuristics have been also investigated. Based on results obtained in that paper, we have chosen given heuristics that could be used to obtain the initial solution for ACO mechanism and stand as a Hybrid Ant Colony Optimization (HAntCO). A very significant fact is that depending on optimized criterion (duration or cost) various priority rule could be used. Therefore, we are able to decide whether using HAntCO allows to get better solutions than using ACO mechanism not supported by any priority rule.

Investigating ACO–based approach was motivated by the willingness to compare results obtained using several collective intelligence methods and other metaheuristics, such as TS or SA (Myszkowski et al., 2013) to solve this problem. As we had researched EA–based approach before (Skowroński et al., 2013a), we made a comparison of different approaches in case of their robustness, effectiveness and stability, while those terms would be explained further.

The dataset for experiments has been created artificially, but instances are based on the real–world ones obtained from an international enterprise. What is more, presented MS–RCPSP could be generalized to the PSPLIB (Kolisch et al., 1996) dataset model that is regarded as a benchmark for methods solving project scheduling problems.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes selected ways of solving the (MS–) RCPSP using metaheuristics, especially ACO. Section 3 presents the MS–RCPSP problem statement, while Section 4 describes the approaches proposed in this paper. Section 5 provides conducted experiments of proposed methods in a given dataset. Finally, section 6 presents the conclusions of obtained results and suggests some directions of future work.

2 Related work

Metaheuristics are very often used to solve RCPSP because of its NP–hard nature. EA ((Hartmann , 1998), (Valls et al., 2008), (Valls et al., 2001)), TS ((Thomas et al., 1998), (Tsai et al., 1998), (Verhoeven, 1998)), SA ((Bouleimen et al., 2003), (Das et al., 2011)) are well explored and widely applied to solve MS–RCPSP. It is worth a mention that ACO is not the only swarm intelligence metaheuristic used in solving (MS–) RCPSP. PSO approaches could be found in (Tam et al., 2006), (Zhang et al., 2005), (Zhang et al., 2009), while bee colony optimization (BCO) method has been investigated in (Ziarati et al., 2011). Numerous papers regarding PSO or BCO in solving RCPSP prove that those methods are often investigated and researched.

However, there is still lack of papers regarding multi–objective Multi–Skill extension of RCPSP. Some approaches solving MS–RCPSP in project duration domain (Al–Anzi et al., 2010), (Santos et al., 2011) or project cost domain (Li et al., 2009) could be found. On the other hand, there are methods solving classical RCPSP extended by cost domain but without skills considerations. Such research has been presented in (Phruksaphanrat, 2014), (Jaberi et al., 2014), (Gonzalez et al., 2013), (Luna et al., 2013) and (Yannibelli et al., 2013). Hence we have decided to combine those two elements: multi–objective optimization and multi–skill domain for project scheduling problem.

Although classical RCPSP is deeply investigated and numerous approaches could be easily compared using PSPLIB instances, it is very hard to find multi–objective MS–RCPSP methods working on datasets that could be regarded as a benchmark. Some papers describe instances artificially generated ((Hegazy et al., 2000), (Santos et al., 2011)), while some others propose methods of PSPLIB dataset adaptation ((Al–Anzi et al., 2010), (Drezet et al., 2008), (Kadrou et al., 2006), (Li et al., 2009)). However, both of those approaches for handling MS–RCPSP benchmark data are not supplied by any published dataset instances. Hence the need of proposing our own dataset has arisen.

ACO is inspired by the rules in the real environment of ants. Real ants are capable of finding the shortest path from the source of food to the ant's nest. Every ant from a population leaves a substance called pheromone while getting to the source of food. This substance attracts other ants to come into that direction. However, the pheromone evaporates gradually in every period. It means the shorter path is, the less pheromone would be evaporated and that path would be more attractive to other ants. In that way, more and more ants start to exploit the region of a surface where there was more

pheromone – the path to the source of food was shorter. Finally, all ants move along the same path, what is regarded as the found solution of the problem.

A classical ACO approach with some modifications that made it more robust has been presented in (Merkle et al., 2002). Particularly, the following features have been proposed: combination of two pheromone updating methods, dynamic influence of those methods during ACO runtime and possibility of leaving the best obtained solution by an elitist ant to preserve sticking in local optima. The presented methods have been tested on PSPLIB instances. In many cases, the obtained results were better than the best found so far, what confirms the robustness of that approach.

Various improvements of ACO have been proposed in (Luo et al., 2003). A single solution, represented by a single ant, is obtained using serial generation scheme. If generated schedule turns out to be infeasible after adding a given task, the ant can reschedule some beginning fragment of a current schedule in order to make it feasible. The feasibility is lost when precedence constraints are violated. The following activities that should be added to a current schedule are chosen by combination of classical heuristics: most total successors, latest finish time (LFT) and resource scheduling method. The authors used UBO dataset from ProGen (Kolisch et al., 1996) to verify their approach.

A different ACO approach has been presented in (Zhou et al., 2009) as well. The combination of Ant Colony System (Dorigo, 1997) and Max–Min Ant System (Stutzle et al., 2000) called MMACS has been proposed. The following improvements have been proposed in this approach: pseudorandom proportional rule for choosing a next activity, updating pheromone only in the base of the best ant from given iteration and serial schedule generation scheme. Furthermore, an extended and RCPSP–adjusted 2opt local search method (Watson et al., 1998) called PS–2opt has been proposed. Results of experiments conducted on PSPLIB stated that PS–2opt and MMACS methods are robust in solving RCPSP.

Another ACO–based approach has been presented in (Liang et al., 2004) where activity–on–node task precedence relations representation is considered. Activity selection is performed by forward–parallel method, while the search space exploration and exploitation is performed by tuned online and offline pheromone updating procedure. Conclusions supported by performed experiments on PSPLIB datasets stand that the approach proposed in (Liang et al., 2004) gives competitive results in comparison to other (not–only) ACO–based approaches.

3 Problem statement

Before the description of the multi–skill extension for RCPSP, the fundamentals of classical RCPSP would be presented. The motivation to investigate RCPSP and its extensions came from industry and would be explained in detail in Subsection 3.3.

3.1 *Classical RCPSP description*

In RCPSP a set of tasks is given, while every task is described by its duration, start and finish dates. Tasks are non-preemptive. It means any task cannot be withdrawn if it has been started. Tasks are related to each other by precedence relations, describing which tasks are needed to be completed before some other could be started. Tasks that have to be finished before the start time of another task are called predecessors. In classical RCPSP resource units are provided. Every resource owns a finite number of units (represented as integer numbers) that could be assigned to various tasks while tasks require some number of units to be performed. Cumulative number of units of tasks assigned to specified resource in a given period cannot exceed a number of units owned by resource. Only one resource can be assigned to a given task but not only one task can be assigned to given resource in given timestamp. In classical RCPSP, two dummy activities are added - start and finish tasks. It is because, in RCPSP, every task besides the start one has predecessors. Hence finish time of the last, dummy finish task is the finish time of schedule and the duration of a project could be computed as duration between start time of dummy start task and finish time of finish dummy task. The goal of RCPSP is to find such task–to–resource assignments to make the final schedule feasible and as shortest as possible. Combinatorial nature of the RCPSP makes it NP–hard.

A solution of RCPSP is a feasible schedule – the one in which resource units and precedence constraints are preserved.

3.2 *Multi–skill extension of RCPSP*

MS–RCPSP extension adds the skills domain to classical RCPSP. Every task requires some skill at given familiarity level to be performed, while every resource disposes some skills pool – subset of skill types (e.g. developer, analyst, tester, architect, etc.) defined in a project with given familiarity level. Therefore, the resource R is capable of performing the task T only if R disposes skill required by T at the same or higher level. The capabilities of performing tasks by resources could

be presented as skill matrix. Sample skill matrix has been shown in the Fig. 1.



Fig. 1 Example of skill matrix

In the skill matrix presented in the Fig. 1 skills required by task to be performed have been written over task definition, while skills owned by resources have been written next to resource definition. This figure presents sample resource capabilities: resource $R1$ disposes skills $Q1$ and $Q2$ with familiarity level 3 and 2 respectively. It is capable of performing task $T1$, $T3$ and $T4$ because all of those mentioned tasks require skill owned by $R1$ at no higher level than it has. $R1$ cannot be assigned to $T2$, because this task requires totally different skill that $R1$ does not dispose of, even at the lowest familiarity level. Analogously, resource $R2$ can be assigned to task $T2$, resource $R3$ is a proper one for task $T3$ and, finally, resource $R4$ can perform tasks $T1$, $T2$ and $T3$. Even though $R3$ disposes of skill $Q2$, it cannot be assigned to $T1$ and $T3$ because those tasks require $Q2$ at higher familiarity level that this resource disposes.

3.3 *Model adjustment*

As a result of consultations with representatives of various enterprises, we decided to introduce some practical changes in classical RCPSP extended to MS–RCPSP model. Firstly, we introduced resource salary (as an hourly wage) paid for performed work. In that case, resources are regarded only as human ones varied by their salary. We also resigned from introducing start and finish dummy activities as our approach assumes that there could be some tasks that are not connected by precedence relations with any other. Hence we cannot define the project duration, start time and finish time based on dummy activities.

What is more, resources are not described by units – any resource cannot be assigned to more than one task in an overlapping period – dedicated resources (Bianco et al., 1998). If such a situation occurs, the **conflict** is detected and should be resolved. The conflict fixing procedure is presented in Subsec. 4.4.

Schedule feasibility for such modified problem is extended from classical RCPSP schedule feasibility definition by skills domain – only resources capable of performing given tasks can be assigned to them.

3.4 *Problem formulation*

Feasible Project Schedule (PS) consists of $J = 1, ..., n$ tasks and $K = 1, ..., m$ resources. A non pre–emptive duration d_j, start time S_j and finish time F_j is defined for each task. Predecessors of given task j are defined as P_j. Each resource is defined by its hourly rate salary s_k and owned skills $Q^k = 1, ..., r$, while pool of owned skills is a subset of all skills defined in project $Q^k \in Q$. Value l_q denotes the level of given skill, while h_q describes its type and q_j is a skill required by j to be performed. Therefore, by J^k subset of tasks that can be performed by k resource is defined. Duration of a project schedule is denoted as τ. Cost of performing j task by k resource is denoted as $c_j^k = d_j * s_k$, where s_k describes the salary of resource k assigned to j. For simplicity, we have modified the task's performance cost from c_j^k to c_j, because only one resource can be assigned to given task. Hence there is no need to distinguish various costs for the same task. Moreover, we have introduced variable defining whether k is assigned to j in given time t: $U_{j,k}^t \in \{0; 1\}$. If $U_{j,k}^t = 1$, k is assigned to j in t. Analogously, k is not assigned to j in t if $U_{j,k}^t = 0$.

Feasible project schedule (PS) belongs to the set of all feasible and non–feasible solutions (violating precedence-, resource- and skills-constraints) : $PS \in PS_{all}$.

Formally, the problem could be regarded as optimization (minimization) problem and stated as follows:

$$\min f(PS) = \min \left[f_\tau(PS), f_C(PS) \right] \tag{1}$$

Subject to:

$$\forall_{k \in K} s_k \geq 0, \forall_{k \in K} Q^k \neq \emptyset \tag{2}$$

$$\forall_{j \in J} F_j \geq 0; \forall_{j \in J} d_j \geq 0 \tag{3}$$

$$\forall_{j \in J, j \neq 1, i \in P_j} F_i \leq F_j - d_j \tag{4}$$

$$\forall_{i \in J^k} \exists_{q \in Q^k} \; h_q = h_{q_i} \wedge l_q \geq l_{q_i} \tag{5}$$

$$\forall_{k \in K} \forall_{t \in \tau} \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_{i,k}^t \leq 1 \tag{6}$$

$$\forall_{j \in J} \exists_{!t \in \tau, !k \in K} U_{j,k}^t = 1 \tag{7}$$

Eq. 1 denotes the duration and cost optimization respectively. Depending on the evaluation function configuration (described below), various optimization modes could be used in an optimization process. $f_\tau(PS)$ is an evaluation function of project schedule's duration, while $f_C(PS)$ is an evaluation function of project schedule's performance cost.

The first constraint (Eq. 2) preserves the positive values of resource salaries and ability to perform at least one task by every resource. Eq. 3 states that every task has positive finish date and duration, while Eq. 4 shows the precedence constrains rule. Next two equations: Eq. 5 introduces skill constraints and transforms RCPSP into MS–RCPSP. Constraint (Eq. 6) describes that any resource can be assigned to no more than one task in given time during the project. The last constraint (Eq. 7) says that each task must be performed in schedule PS by one resource assignment.

3.5 *Evaluation function*

As it was mentioned, the proposed approach allows to set various objectives of optimization: duration– or cost– oriented one. Those two aspects are normalized, weighted and summarized. Normalization is necessary because of different domains of both aspects that are in opposition to each other. Setting optimization more cost–oriented causes enlarging the project duration, while setting as more important the duration aspect of optimization could increase the cost of the project.

The detailed formulation of the evaluation function has been presented in Sec. 4.2.

3.6 *Solution space size*

Because of NP–hard (combinatorial) nature of investigated problem, we have decided to present an estimation of solution space size (SS). It has been computed as follows:

$$SS(n,m) = n! * m^n \tag{8}$$

The above estimation is valid for all solutions, including non–feasible ones. Computing factorial of tasks number provides the number of combinations of ordering tasks within the timeline. It is easy to notice that such estimation allows to set any order, skipping precedence constraints. The second element of Eq. 8 provides the number of resource–to–task assignments, including a situation that the same resource is assigned to all tasks and no skill constraints are preserved.

To imagine how big the solution space could be, let's take into account a sample project schedule with 100 tasks and 20 resources. Using Eq. 8, the solution space size is equal to $SS(100,20) = 1.19 * 10^{288}$ solutions, including both feasible and infeasible ones.

4 Proposed approach

Before we describe the details of the proposed approach, some basic ACO definitions in terms of MS–RCPSP should be introduced. **Colony** is represented as a set of ants: $A = 1, ..., p$, where p is a number of ants in population. **Edge** represents a given task and resources that are capable of performing it. Furthermore, edge stores information about the pheromone ($Ph_j = 1, ..., p_j^k$) values for each resource capable of performing a given task. **Surface** is represented as a set of edges: $E = 1, ..., j$ – all possible task–to–resource assignments, while **path** represents the set of specified task–to–resource assignments. Path is assigned to a given ant that represents a single solution. Surface represents the solution space of skill–feasible solutions.

The pheromone value determines the probability of assigning given resource to given task. In the first step of classical ACO, the initial value of pheromone is given for each resource in every edge while for a heuristic initialization, pheromone value is the biggest for path reflecting solution found by heuristic. It means that, at the beginning of our approach run, the probability of choosing resource to be assigned to a task is equal in classical ACO or is close to 1 for path representing heuristic–found solution and close to 0 for remaining edges in the surface.

Firstly we have used heuristics from (Skowroński et al., 2013b) to find the best approach for duration optimization (DO) and cost optimization (CO) modes. Based on the obtained results, successors list size–based heuristic (SLS) (Skowroński et al., 2013b) with descending order has been used for DO and resource salary–based (RS) (Skowroński et al., 2013b) with ascending order has been used for CO. Output of scheduling project instances by those heuristics has been used as input for ACO method that has been run with the same parameters' configuration as ACO not boosted by heuristic.

The proposed hybrid ACO–based approach could be briefly described in the following steps:

1. Set initial ant population using heuristics to find *good* initial solution
2. Check the stopping condition.
3. Select edge for each ant.
4. Evaluate solutions.
5. Evaporate given amount of pheromone from each edge.
6. Update solutions.

7. Update pheromone value in edges by selected ants.
8. Return to 2.

The pseudocode of investigated HAntCO approach is presented in Alg. 1.

Algorithm 1 HAntCO pseudocode

```
1: A ← set initial solution
2: while stopping criterion not satisfied do
3:    for a ∈ A do
4:       for e ∈ Path(a) do
5:          e ← selectEdge(J^k)
6:          f(a) ← evaluate(a)
7:    for e ∈ E do
8:       p_e ← decayPheromone()
9:    A' ← selectAnts(A)
10:   for a' ∈ A' do
11:      for e ∈ Path(a') do
12:         p_e ← updatePheromone(e)
13:   A_b ← getBestAnt(A)
14:   A_w ← getWorstAnt(A)
15:   if f(A_b) < f(A_g) then
16:      A_g ← A_b
17:   if f(A_w) > f(A_v) then
18:      A_v ← A_w
19:   A ← A'
20: return A_g
```

In every iteration, some ants have to be selected (line 9 in Alg. 1) to update a pheromone on their edges. The decision which ant should be chosen depends on selected pheromone update methods. There could be all ants chosen, only the local and global best or the local best and worst. Choosing ants to update a pheromone has been described in detail in Subsection 4.3. After each iteration, pheromone values are updated. Then local (A_b) and global (A_g) best solutions are updated. After each iteration, solutions in ants are ordered ascending by their evaluation function value (line 13). The first ant from the list is set as the best one (A_b) while the last one – as the worst local one. If the evaluation function value of the best local solution (A_b) is smaller (minimization problem) than evaluation function value for the best global solution (A_g), the best global solution is updated (line 15). Analogously the global worst solution (A_v) is updated. The local worst solution (A_w) is used in DIFF pheromone update method.

4.1 *HAntCO Colony initialization*

In the first step of classical ACO, the surface of n edges is obtained. For each resource in each edge, the initial pheromone value is set. Then p ants are defined by choosing random capable resource to j task. To reduce the influence of non–determinism and make search more directed, we have decided to introduce a heuristic initialization in hybrid called HAntCO. In HAntCO, one ant has assigned schedule obtained by heuristic described in (Skowroński et al., 2013b). This ant is set as favourable – it can leave much more pheromone than any other ant in a colony. Other ants in the colony are defined in the same way as in classical ACO initial colony definition.

Heuristic used to obtain an initial solution is varied depending on the optimization mode. For the Duration Optimization mode (DO) the Successors' List Size (SLS) heuristic has been used, as it provided the best results for DO mode. In this method, tasks are sorted by a number of successors they have in ascending order. Then for every task from ordered list a resource is assigned. The decision which resource should be assigned is determined by the earliest time when given resource would finish its previous tasks it has been assigned to.

For Cost Optimization (CO) mode, resources are sorted ascending by their standard salary rate and then are assigned to tasks from the list given in project definition, preserving skill constraints and avoiding conflicts, by assigning a given task to resource no earlier than all previously assigned tasks to resource would be finished.

In the next step each solution is evaluated, to set the pheromone value for each ant in the next iteration. The amount of pheromone left in every iteration is set according to the ant chosen as the best.

As the **stopping criterion**, the number of iterations with no change of global best solution has been proposed in this approach. It is notated as γ.

The probability of selecting resource k to task j in **edge selection** bases on the roulette method and is computed as follows:

$$prob_j^k = \frac{{p_j^k}^\alpha}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} {p_i^k}^\alpha} \tag{9}$$

Where α is a weight for pheromone values influence. This value is the parameter of ACO approach and should be provided by the user. p_j^k is a pheromone value stored in the edge containing information about k resource performing j task.

4.2 *Evaluation solution method*

Evaluation function is formulated as follows:

$$\min f(PS) = w_\tau f_\tau(PS) + (1 - w_\tau) f_c(PS) \tag{10}$$

where: w_τ – weight of duration component, $f_\tau(PS)$ – duration evaluation component, $f_c(PS)$ – cost evaluation component. Both components are non–negative values, while $w_\tau \in [0; 1]$.

Summing both components' weight to 1 ensures that changing the importance of one aspect would cause also some change of second aspect's importance.

The time component $f_\tau(PS)$ is calculated as follows:

$$f_\tau(PS) = \frac{\tau}{\tau_{max}} \tag{11}$$

where: τ_{max} – maximal (pessimistic) possible duration of the schedule PS, computed as the sum of all tasks' duration. It occurs when all tasks are performed serially in project: one–by–one. No matter how many and how flexible resources are.

The cost component $f_c(PS)$ is defined as follows:

$$f_c(PS) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{J} c_j}{c_{max} - c_{min}} \tag{12}$$

where: c_{min} – minimal schedule cost – the total cost of all tasks assigned to the cheapest resource, c_{max} – maximal schedule cost – a total cost of all tasks assigned to the most expensive resource. Note: c_{max} and c_{min} do not involve skill constraints. It means that c_{min} value could be reached only for non–feasible solution. Analogously to c_{max}.

4.3 *Update pheromone*

Pheromone evaporates iterative. It means the pheromone value is decreased by the same value (μ) in every iteration, as it was stated in the Eq. 13.

$$(p_j^k)^{(i+1)} = (p_j^k)^i(1-\mu) \tag{13}$$

Obtained results for various update pheromone methods strongly depend on values set for the following parameters used in ACO:

- p_{init} – initial value of pheromone amount in each edge,
- μ – amount of pheromone evaporated in each iteration,
- δ – amount of pheromone left in edges by ants,
- p_{min} – minimal value of pheromone set for resource in edge.

In the proposed approach, three strategies of setting pheromones have been researched: *ALL* (Liang et al., 2004), *ELITE* (Merkle et al., 2002) and *DIFF*. The last of the proposed ones is the new one, proposed by the authors of this paper.

4.3.1 Update pheromone – ALL

In this approach, every ant can leave the pheromone value in the edge for selected resource (Liang et al., 2004). The better the solution is, the more pheromone could be left by the ant in given edge. The best ant leaves the pheromone in the amount equal to δ. All next ants leave the amount of pheromone equal to δ divided by the ant's position (pos) in the list ordered ascending by the evaluation function value.

$$(p_j^k)^{(i+1)} = (p_j^k)^i + \frac{\delta}{pos} \tag{14}$$

The main advantage of this approach is the method's resistance to being stuck in local optima. On the other hand, this approach raises a risk of missing the best solutions because of the more exploratory than exploitation–based character of search process.

4.3.2 Update pheromone – ELITE

In this approach, only elite ants are allowed to leave the pheromone on given edges. The set of elite ants always contains two ants: the one with the best solution found in the current iteration (A_b) and the global best one (A_g) (Merkle et al., 2002) – with the best solution found from the beginning of search process. For both ants, the same pheromone amount update method is set:

$$(p_j^k)^{(i+1)} = (p_j^k)^i + \delta \tag{15}$$

As this approach is more local–optimum oriented, it could lead to getting stuck in local optima. However, the convergence to the optimum of this approach is faster than in ALL method.

4.3.3 Update pheromone – DIFF

In this approach, the ant with the worst or best found solution in given iteration is selected. Updating the pheromone value by *the worst* allows to explore the search space in other than potentially the best directions and, consequently, escape from local optima. The same like in ELITE approach, only two ants are able to leave the pheromone: the best (A_b) / worst (A_w) in iteration and global best (A_g) / global worst (A_v) found so far. The decision which ant (best or worst) should leave pheromone is made on the basis of satisfaction of the following condition:

$$\pi > \psi \tag{16}$$

Where π is regarded as an ant population variety and is computed as follows:

$$\pi = \frac{f_w - f_b}{f_w} \tag{17}$$

Where f_b and f_w are the evaluation function values of the best and worst solutions contained by given ants in specified iteration. The right–sided variable ψ could be regarded as an ant population variety threshold and is set as an ACO parameter.

If condition in Eq. 16 is satisfied, ELITE update pheromone method is used. With every iteration in which condition from Eq. 16 is satisfied, the counter (κ) of possible worst pheromone update strategy use is incremented. If the variety computed in Eq. 16 is not satisfied, it means ants are concentrated near some local optima. Then, to avoid being stuck, the worst update method is launched. It means that not the best but worst ants leave pheromone on their path. Meanwhile the counter κ is decremented. The worst ant can leave pheromone as long as the ant population variety is smaller than ψ or the κ is not negative. Initial κ value is also set as an ACO parameter.

The value of pheromone left by the global ant is defined in Eq. 18. For the global best (or worst) ant the pheromone amount update value is defined as follows:

$$(p_j^k)^{(i+1)} = (p_j^k)^i + \frac{\delta}{\gamma} \tag{18}$$

Where γ is a number of iterations from the last found new global best.

For the best / worst ant in iteration, the pheromone amount update value is stated as follows:

$$(p_j^k)^{(i+1)} = (p_j^k)^i + \frac{\delta}{\pi} \tag{19}$$

In update pheromone amount method for global ant (Eq. 18) the pheromone amount is reduced, while the pheromone amount for the best local ant is increased (Eq. 19). It enhances the possibility of finding new global optimum, reducing the probability of losing the best solution found so far at the same time.

4.4 Conflict fixing

A conflict appears when more than one task is assigned to the same resource in overlapping periods. In that case, it should be fixed by the following procedure.

It is performed by shifting one of conflicting task's start date. Consequently, the finish date of that task also has to be shifted in order to keep the task duration. The decision which of conflicting tasks should be shifted depends on which of them starts earlier. If they are set to start at exactly the same time, task to be shifted is selected by the way, which was firstly added to project definition. Furthermore, we do not investigate the velocity of resources. Therefore, job duration is constant regardless of assigned resource and skills it owns.

Conflict fixing procedure illustration has been presented in the Fig. 2.

Tasks $T4$ and $T5$ have been assigned to the Resource $R2$ in overlapping period. As a conflict fixing result, a new schedule has been presented, where $T5$ starts just after the $T4$ should be finished. The $T5$ has been shifted, because it was initially set to start later than the $T4$.



Fig. 2 Example of conflict resolving

5 Experiments and results

The goal of the conducted experiments was to investigate the following issues:

- robustness of ACO approach for MS–RCPSP based on given dataset,
- robustness of various update pheromone methods,
- comparing HAntCO to classical ACO approach and other (meta–)heuristics.

Therefore, we have compared the results obtained for different update pheromone methods and results for hybrids and classical ACO approach. Furthermore, the results for simple heuristic scheduling have been provided to get a reference for the ACO–based mechanism.

The obtained results (project schedules) are described by duration time ([days]) and performance cost ([currency units]). Those project schedule properties have been used to compare the investigated methods.

5.1 *iMOPSE* dataset

Due to evaluating not only the project schedule duration, but also the cost of the schedule, we cannot use the standard PSPLIB benchmark dataset (Kolisch et al., 1996) that does not contain any information about the task performance cost. What is more, PSPLIB dataset instances do not reflect the MS–RCPSP. Hence, lack of benchmark data has encouraged us to prepare the *iMOPSE* dataset, containing 36 project instances, that have been artificially created[1], on the basis of real–world instances, obtained from an international enterprise. We recommend other scientists using *iMOPSE* dataset as a benchmark for investigating their approaches in solving MS–RCPSP as defined.

[1] http://imopse.ii.pwr.wroc.pl/ – iMOPSE (intelligent Multi Objective Project Scheduling Environment) project homepage, containing description of investigated methods, dataset definition and best found solutions.

Instances of the dataset have been created according to the analysis made in cooperation with experienced project manager from Volvo IT. We were not allowed to get real project data because of their sensitive character for the enterprise. However, we made a statistical analysis of real projects. Then we prepared artificial dataset instances according to the analysis result, regarding the most common project characteristics, like a number of tasks, a number of resources, various skill types in enterprise and the structure of critical chain (a number of tasks involved by precedence relations), etc.

Table 1 iMOPSE dataset summary

Dataset instance	Tasks	Resources	Relations	Skills
100_20_23_9_D1	100	20	23	9
100_20_22_15	100	20	22	15
100_20_47_9	100	20	47	9
100_20_46_15	100	20	46	15
100_20_65_9	100	20	65	9
100_20_65_15	100	20	65	15
100_10_27_9_D2	100	10	27	9
100_10_26_15	100	10	26	15
100_10_47_9	100	10	47	9
100_10_48_15	100	10	48	15
100_10_64_9	100	10	64	9
100_10_65_15	100	10	65	15
100_5_20_9_D3	100	5	20	9
100_5_20_15	100	5	22	15
100_5_48_9	100	5	48	9
100_5_48_15	100	5	46	15
100_5_64_9	100	5	64	9
100_5_64_15	100	5	64	15
200_40_45_9	200	40	45	9
200_40_45_15	200	40	45	15
200_40_90_9	200	40	90	9
200_40_91_9	200	40	91	15
200_40_130_9_D4	200	40	130	9
200_40_144_15	200	40	133	15
200_20_55_9	200	20	55	9
200_20_54_15	200	20	54	15
200_20_97_9	200	20	97	9
200_20_97_15	200	20	97	15
200_20_150_9_D5	200	20	150	9
200_20_145_15	200	20	145	15
200_10_50_9	200	10	50	9
200_10_50_15	200	10	50	15
200_10_84_9	200	10	84	9
200_10_85_15	200	10	85	15
200_10_135_9_D6	200	10	135	9
200_10_128_15	200	10	128	15

The iMOPSE dataset summary has been presented in the Table 1. There are two groups of created project instances: one contains 100 tasks and the second – 200 tasks. Within each group, project instances are varied by a number of available resources and the precedence relationship complexity. The number of resources for instances from both groups were chosen in a way to preserve constant average resource load and average task relations ratio for given instances. Hence for project instances with 200 tasks the number of possible resources and precedence relations is twice bigger than for project instances containing 100 tasks. The skill variety has been set up to 9 or 15 different skill types for each project instance, while any resource can dispose of exactly six different skill types. Because of the different resources and relations number, the scheduling complexity for each project is varied.

This dataset stands as an extension of dataset presented in (Skowroński et al., 2013a), (Myszkowski et al., 2013), (Skowroński et al., 2013b) and that is the reason some instances are named with suffix Dx. This suffix refers to dataset instances that have been previously created and presented in those papers. Because of the extension of the dataset, the need of introducing more clear namesystem has arisen. Suffix has been added to a reference of previously created files, keeping the naming convention applied after dataset extension.

5.2 Experiments' set–up

The experiments have been divided into investigating the influence of ACO parameters' configurations for project duration and performance cost in three various components' weights in evaluation function: duration optimization (DO: $w_\tau = 1$, see. Eq. 10), balanced optimization (BO: $w_\tau = 0.5$) and cost optimization (CO: $w_\tau = 0$). Because of the stochastic nature of ACO–based methods, each experiment for given parameter configuration has been repeated ten times. For K–S test and t–test each experiment has been repeated 50 times (see Tab.9 and Tab.10). On the other hand, deterministic character of heuristics allowed us to obtain results for those methods in only one iteration for every parameters' configuration.

The further step of the conducted experiments was to compare results obtained for random initial solution with boosting initial solution by using described hybrids. Initial solution has been previously obtained by using the above–mentioned heuristics and then set them as input for ACO and made those results as more favourable in local search by enhancing the pheromone value left in this path representing initial solution. We decided to use SLS(D) (Skowroński et al., 2013b) for DO mode and RS(A) (Skowroński et al., 2013b) for CO mode optimization within HAntCO hybrid. Because of some code refactoring, we were able to tune our heuristics and obtain a better solution than the found ones in (Skowroński et al., 2013b). That is the reason why the results of those heuristics in this paper are slightly better than the results in (Skowroński et al., 2013b) for given dataset instances.

Table 2 Comparison of the best obtained results for DO, BO and CO modes in classical ACO and selected heuristics from (Skowroński et al., 2013b)

Dataset instance	ACO									Heuristics				
	DO			BO			CO			DO		CO		
	M	Days	Cost	M	Days	Cost	M	Days	Cost	Days	Cost	C	Days	Cost
100_10_26_15	E	**32**	124687	E/D	85	70326	E/D	85	**70326**	37	126361	RS(A)	85	**70326**
100_10_27_9_D2	E	**34**	44999	D	72	27120	E/D	129	**26323**	38	44309	RS(A)	129	**26323**
100_10_47_9	E	**36**	143100	D	105	94334	E/D	145	**90992**	41	142759	RS(A)	145	**90992**
100_10_48_15	E	**33**	133062	E/D	81	87194	E	85	**87187**	36	135534	RS(A)	85	**87187**
100_10_64_9	D	**35**	110643	D	92	63934	E/D	121	**62102**	39	113124	RS(A)	121	**62102**
100_10_65_15	E	**35**	150294	E/D	76	108312	E/D	98	**106296**	40	152955	RS(A)	98	**106296**
100_20_22_15	D	**20**	120949	D	56	56625	D	87	55240	25	117493	ADAD	86	**55240**
100_20_23_9_D1	D	**32**	52119	D	60	30900	D	121	30107	32	53154	AAAD	119	**30104**
100_20_46_15	E	**25**	138565	D	65	69789	E/D	75	**68899**	28	138270	RS(A)	75	**68899**
100_20_47_9	E	**21**	124817	D	69	59196	D	131	**55197**	21	129160	RS(A)	131	**55197**
100_20_65_15	E	**27**	109831	D	52	57338	E/D	69	**57085**	32	110503	RS(A)	69	57085
100_20_65_9	E	**23**	130934	D	76	61913	D	114	59736	25	127149	RS(A)	114	**59736**
100_5_20_9_D3	E	**50**	41029	D	75	31681	E/D	167	**30164**	57	40539	RS(A)	167	**30164**
100_5_22_15	D	**60**	119434	D	70	110145	E/D	86	**109111**	63	119266	RS(A)	86	**109111**
100_5_46_15	E	**67**	204110	*	125	184409	E/D	125	**184409**	75	202238	RS(A)	125	**184409**
100_5_48_9	E	**62**	191712	E/D	127	175526	E/D	130	**175225**	72	193383	RS(A)	130	**175225**
100_5_64_15	D	**62**	144972	E/D	123	109431	E/D	141	**109091**	71	141407	RS(A)	141	**109091**
100_5_64_9	E	**61**	102777	D	87	74617	E/D	173	**72848**	71	102439	RS(A)	173	**72848**
200_10_128_15	E	**62**	178264	D	126	136643	E	143	136551	71	180812	AxAD	159	**134425**
200_10_135_9_D6	*	**216**	99375	E	237	72753	D	274	72036	216	105593	RS(A)	256	**71986**
200_10_50_15	E	**63**	191856	D	144	85712	E/D	167	**84308**	66	189660	RS(A)	167	**84308**
200_10_50_9	E	**65**	250075	D	228	110218	D	318	105232	66	251158	RS(A)	318	**105198**
200_10_84_9	E	**69**	226666	D	171	125715	D	316	117754	70	224121	DAAA	338	117543
200_10_85_15	E	**61**	306949	E	180	197767	E	215	**195820**	65	304277	RS(A)	215	**195820**
200_20_145_15	E	36	278199	D	109	144694	D	152	143688	**36**	275983	RS(A)	158	**143497**
200_20_150_9_D5	D	186	91461	D	247	52620	D	296	51678	**183**	92821	ADDA	337	**51496**
200_20_54_15	E	39	299993	D	123	161883	D	131	161614	**37**	295786	RS(A)	125	**161412**
200_20_55_9	D	38	231094	D	159	75836	D	250	72176	**37**	230150	RS(A)	332	**70057**
200_20_97_15	D	**42**	280951	D	115	160070	D	169	157202	49	290399	RS(A)	171	**156951**
200_20_97_9	E	37	275819	D	114	102641	D	150	99901	**35**	273378	RS(A)	169	**98480**
200_40_130_9_D4	*	**112**	94488	D	132	48362	D	205	48419	112	101879	DAAD	214	**46133**
200_40_133_15	D	27	281933	D	93	101620	D	131	99329	**24**	276456	AAAA	155	**97345**
200_40_45_15	E	**25**	248717	D	118	95959	D	161	91010	31	260738	RS(A)	213	**87955**
200_40_45_9	E	26	273632	D	118	96375	D	179	94142	**22**	270758	AAAA	334	**77236**
200_40_90_9	E	26	287694	D	115	97926	D	142	96312	**24**	290028	RS(A)	285	**80732**
200_40_91_15	E	25	257927	D	82	91204	D	132	88616	**19**	249909	RS(A)	184	**86476**

To present averaged results in detail (see Tab. 4), a standard deviation measure (σ) has been introduced and applied to each average value, presented as a percentage value in relation to the average. We have also added information about the best found solution for a given method (see Tab. 2) that have been compared with the results obtained by most promising heuristics, described in (Skowroński et al., 2013b).

Both for the best and averaged results, pheromone update methods have been compared and the one that provided best results (shortest duration in DO, smallest cost in CO and smallest evaluation function value in BO) has been presented in Tab. 4 and Tab. 2. The notation for methods used in tables with obtained results is as the following: E - update ELITE pheromone method, A - update ALL, D - update DIFF. If more than one pheromone update methods turned out to be the best and gave the same results, they have been presented both separated by "/" (e.g.: E/D – both update DIFF and update ELITE methods gave the same, best results). In Tab. 2 a sign $*$ has been also introduced to indicate a situation where all three methods provided the same, regarded as the best, result.

All the results presented in tables have been obtained for given ACO parameter configuration: $p = 12$, $\mu = 0.1$, $p_{init} = 1.5$, $\alpha = 1$, $\delta = 0.05$, $p_{min} = 0.05$, $h_{init} = 1$, $\beta = 0$, $\gamma = 150$, $\sigma = 30$, $\psi = 0.1$, $\kappa_{init} = 20$. This configuration has been regarded as the best, defined as a result of the previous parameter–tuning experiments. The same configuration has been chosen to be used in every pheromone update method (ALL, ELITE, DIFF), every optimization mode approach (DO, BO, CO) both for ACO and HAntCO approaches.

5.3 Experiments' performance

The processing time was varied in relation to the used update method. For ALL method that could be regarded as the simplest, the processing time was relatively small (from 7 to 90 seconds, depending on processed dataset instance). However, for ELITE and DIFF methods, that are regarded as more complex because of the need of sorting ants and choosing best / worst, the processing time varied from 30 to 270 seconds per one execution in one CPU for given parameter configuration[2].

5.3.1 The best found results

The best results obtained by ACO for CO and DO modes have been compared with the results obtained by using heuristics proposed in (Skowroński et al., 2013b). In Tab. 2 this comparison is presented. For each dataset instance and optimization mode, the best results have been chosen from various pheromone update methods.

[2] Machine for tests was equipped with 8 CPUs Intel Core i7 2.67 GHz each, 24 GB of RAM memory and Ubuntu 12.04 OS.

Table 3 Best results obtained for HAntCO with various pheromone update methods in DO and CO optimization mode

Dataset instance	DO				CO			
	ELITE		DIFF		ELITE		DIFF	
	days	cost	days	cost	days	cost	days	cost
100_10_26_15	**31**	126216	32	125688	85	70326	85	70326
100_10_27_9_D2	**33**	42199	35	44022	129	26323	129	26323
100_10_47_9	**34**	140865	34	142362	145	90992	145	90992
100_10_48_15	33	134692	**33**	133495	85	87187	85	87187
100_10_64_9	**33**	113774	34	115998	121	62102	121	62102
100_10_65_15	33	149175	**32**	149185	98	106296	98	106296
100_20_22_15	**19**	123642	20	118054	87	55240	87	55240
100_20_23_9_D1	**23**	53358	24	54309	117	30104	117	30104
100_20_46_15	**24**	138568	24	142206	75	68899	75	68899
100_20_47_9	**18**	134312	21	133050	131	55197	131	55197
100_20_65_15	**27**	108991	27	113275	69	57085	69	57085
100_20_65_9	21	126659	**20**	128354	114	59736	114	59736
100_5_20_9_D3	53	41310	**53**	40811	167	30164	167	30164
100_5_22_15	**60**	119158	61	119218	86	109111	86	109111
100_5_46_15	**67**	204730	70	205618	125	184409	125	184409
100_5_48_9	**62**	191888	62	192315	130	175225	130	175225
100_5_64_15	61	145322	**61**	143956	141	109091	141	109091
100_5_64_9	**61**	101297	62	103777	173	72848	173	72848
200_10_128_15	**60**	178375	61	180400	143	136551	143	136551
200_10_135_9_D6	**186**	103561	186	105515	269	**71986**	270	71986
200_10_50_15	**62**	190956	62	191149	167	84308	167	84308
200_10_50_9	**63**	253214	64	250850	318	105198	318	105198
200_10_84_9	67	224639	**66**	222655	318	117543	318	117543
200_10_85_15	62	303301	**62**	302064	215	195820	215	195820
200_20_145_15	**35**	272504	35	277291	158	143497	158	143497
200_20_150_9_D5	187	90548	**177**	92567	344	51524	345	**51496**
200_20_54_15	**34**	298822	36	295819	125	161412	125	161412
200_20_55_9	**36**	223879	36	227449	311	70967	332	**70057**
200_20_97_15	42	290308	**42**	277860	171	156951	171	156951
200_20_97_9	**35**	278797	36	270910	155	99190	169	**98480**
200_40_130_9_D4	108	106637	**108**	104965	225	47212	216	**46275**
200_40_133_15	**24**	282730	24	279073	141	97953	144	**97345**
200_40_45_15	**23**	256687	23	256753	201	89407	213	**87955**
200_40_45_9	**25**	270428	26	263162	270	89123	315	**82192**
200_40_90_9	**24**	298340	25	293098	229	93090	247	**84038**
200_40_91_15	**23**	241492	23	248984	176	87875	184	**86476**

Table 4 Averaged results obtained for classical ACO in various optimization modes

Dataset instance	DO					BO					CO				
	M	Days		Cost		M	Days		Cost		M	Days		Cost	
		Avg	σ	Avg	σ		Avg	σ	Avg	σ		Avg	σ	Avg	σ
100_10_26_15	E	33.2	2.6	125436	1.5	D	85	0.0	70326	0.0	E	84.9	0.4	70363	0.1
100_10_27_9_D2	E	36.2	4.1	43382	1.8	E	75.4	2.1	27064	0.1	E	130.5	3.5	26326	0.0
100_10_47_9	E	37.5	2.7	142742	0.4	D	104.9	1.3	94501	0.3	D	144.8	0.4	91088	0.1
100_10_48_15	E	35.2	4.0	135563	2.0	E	81	0.0	87214	0.0	D	85.3	0.5	87205	0.0
100_10_64_9	E	36.8	2.7	114538	1.8	D	90.5	1.3	64231	0.4	D	121	0.0	62136	0.1
100_10_65_15	E	35.8	3.0	152033	1.2	E	76.7	1.4	108266	0.1	E	98	0.0	106299	0.0
100_20_22_15	D	22	4.5	118254	2.9	E	52.5	3.8	57503	1.0	E	84.5	4.0	55431	0.3
100_20_23_9_D1	A	32	0.0	52915	2.5	D	63.2	3.2	31009	0.5	D	115.7	9.2	30212	0.7
100_20_46_15	E	24.9	3.3	140271	2.4	D	67.4	3.6	69574	0.4	D	75.2	0.8	68932	0.1
100_20_47_9	E	23.3	5.1	128127	3.2	D	69.7	3.1	59802	0.9	E	116.6	7.8	56800	1.8
100_20_65_15	E	27.2	1.5	111946	4.0	E	51.4	2.3	57645	0.5	E	66.9	3.7	57131	0.1
100_20_65_9	E	23.9	2.3	126709	2.8	E	71.5	4.5	64189	2.7	D	103.1	10.5	60929	2.6
100_5_20_9_D3	E	52.4	2.4	41152	1.1	E	76.5	2.0	31653	0.1	E	166.9	0.2	30167	0.0
100_5_22_15	E	61	0.7	119479	0.4	E	70.2	0.6	110135	0.0	E	86	0.0	109111	0.0
100_5_46_15	E	68.2	1.7	204507	0.3	E	125	0.0	184409	0.0	E	125	0.0	184409	0.0
100_5_48_9	E	63.1	1.1	191911	0.2	E	127	0.0	175535	0.0	E	130	0.0	175225	0.0
100_5_64_15	E	62.6	0.8	144257	0.7	D	123.1	0.2	109428	0.0	/	141	0.0	109091	0.0
100_5_64_9	E	63	1.9	103527	1.3	D	87	0.0	74617	0.0	E	172.9	0.2	72850	0.0
200_10_128_15	E	63.3	1.9	178421	1.2	D	124.9	1.1	136938	0.2	E	140.7	1.3	136568	0.0
200_10_135_9_D6	E	216	0.0	100758	1.6	D	247.2	1.8	72693	0.5	D	267.3	1.2	72127	0.1
200_10_50_15	E	65.3	1.9	190271	2.2	E	134.3	3.2	87158	0.6	E	166.7	0.4	84402	0.1
200_10_50_9	E	66.6	1.8	247741	1.7	E	220.5	2.8	113340	1.6	D	311	3.0	105825	0.8
200_10_84_9	E	71.1	2.0	224680	1.9	E	162.1	2.0	129065	1.2	E	275.7	7.2	121478	1.3
200_10_85_15	E	64.3	2.2	307437	1.0	E	170.2	3.6	199332	0.7	D	212.3	1.7	196662	0.4
200_20_145_15	E	38.3	2.6	272720	1.8	D	108.3	2.1	146285	0.9	D	143.2	10.5	144947	1.1
200_20_150_9_D5	D	190.7	1.3	91095	3.2	D	237	3.1	54032	2.3	D	266.9	12.1	54512	8.3
200_20_54_15	E	41.2	3.4	288063	2.2	D	124.3	1.7	162514	0.4	D	133.3	4.4	162498	0.4
200_20_55_9	D	39.7	1.6	228459	2.5	D	148.3	9.5	80793	8.5	D	230.5	8.3	75247	4.3
200_20_97_15	D	43.3	2.7	287731	1.6	D	114.9	2.6	160892	0.4	D	160.5	11.1	158560	1.6
200_20_97_9	D	40.8	3.3	281754	2.0	D	112.3	2.7	105641	2.9	D	134	5.2	101992	1.7
200_40_130_9_D4	E	112	0.0	102221	3.4	D	141.7	9.8	51413	11.9	D	185.1	7.2	49156	1.6
200_40_133_15	E	28.4	3.2	282463	2.2	D	89.7	3.1	104442	1.9	D	116.5	10.6	102689	3.0
200_40_45_15	E	26.9	3.9	247230	3.8	D	106.8	7.2	102650	4.0	D	160.8	9.8	94330	3.6
200_40_45_9	E	28.2	4.1	267910	2.1	D	102.6	10.4	106705	6.6	D	182.8	8.3	97018	2.0
200_40_90_9	E	27.4	3.3	288861	2.0	D	109.3	12.1	104403	8.2	D	133	13.1	102871	7.3
200_40_91_15	E	26.4	3.5	242588	2.4	D	80.2	7.9	96756	6.8	D	112.2	10.8	92724	4.0

Indication which method provided the best results is stored in columns named M for every optimization mode.

The obtained best results have been compared with the heuristic results. We decided to omit the name of heuristic if possible to reduce the space covered by the table. For heuristic results in CO, SA heuristic name has been omitted without losing any important information, as the parameter configuration for that method has been written in the table. To give a more detailed view about those methods, please refer to (Skowroński et al., 2013b).

Better values from comparison optimization modes between ACO and heuristics have been written in bold. If key values (duration for DO or cost for CO) were equal for ACO and heuristic approaches, the smallest value of the second aspect has been taken into account to choose a better solution. If both project schedule properties turned out to be the same, both solutions were written in bold.

Table 5 Averaged results obtained for HAntCO with various pheromone update methods in DO and CO optimization mode

Dataset instance	DO								CO							
	ELITE				DIFF				ELITE				DIFF			
	Days		Cost		Days		Cost		Days		Cost		Days		Cost	
	Avg	σ	Avg	σ	Avg	σ	Avg	σ	Avg	σ	Avg	σ	Avg	σ	Avg	σ
100_10_26_15	**32.5**	0.92	125889	1498	32.6	0.49	125848	1373	85	0.00	70326	0	85	0.00	70326	0
100_10_27_9_D2	**35.1**	1.37	43644	661	35.8	0.75	43992	650	129	0.00	26323	0	129	0.00	26323	0
100_10_47_9	**34.9**	1.04	142103	998	35.2	0.75	143263	944	145	0.00	90992	0	145	0.00	90992	0
100_10_48_15	**34**	0.63	134504	1507	34.4	0.66	134568	1509	85	0.00	87187	0	85	0.00	87187	0
100_10_64_9	**34.7**	1.10	113638	1871	34.9	0.54	113230	1899	121	0.00	62102	0	121	0.00	62102	0
100_10_65_15	33.6	0.66	149474	963	**33.2**	0.60	149598	1033	98	0.00	106296	0	98	0.00	106296	0
100_20_22_15	20.7	1.00	118914	2464	**20.6**	0.49	118347	2895	87	0.00	55240	0	87	0.00	55240	0
100_20_23_9_D1	**24.5**	0.81	53810	1028	25	0.77	53051	1243	117	0.00	30104	0	117	0.00	30104	0
100_20_46_15	**24.2**	0.40	140491	2823	24.2	0.40	141045	3922	75	0.00	68899	0	75	0.00	68899	0
100_20_47_9	**20.3**	1.10	128641	2938	21.7	0.46	127577	3023	131	0.00	55204	19	131	0.00	**55197**	0
100_20_65_15	27.2	0.40	111842	2758	**27**	0.00	113219	2501	69	0.00	57085	0	69	0.00	57085	0
100_20_65_9	21.9	0.70	126081	1789	**21.6**	0.80	125269	4271	114	0.90	59744	24	114	0.00	**59736**	0
100_5_20_9_D3	**53.3**	0.46	40917	238	54.4	0.80	41025	148	167	0.00	30164	0	167	0.00	30164	0
100_5_22_15	**61.4**	0.80	119219	486	61.9	0.83	118934	787	86	0.00	109111	0	86	0.00	109111	0
100_5_46_15	**69.8**	1.54	205451	555	70.9	0.30	204973	615	125	0.00	184409	0	125	0.00	184409	0
100_5_48_9	**62.8**	0.40	191934	171	63	0.45	192103	342	130	0.00	175225	0	130	0.00	175225	0
100_5_64_15	**62.6**	1.02	144256	1342	62.9	0.94	144077	813	141	0.00	109091	0	141	0.00	109091	0
100_5_64_9	**62.5**	1.12	102901	1226	62.8	0.75	103495	751	173	0.00	72848	0	173	0.00	72848	0
200_10_128_15	**61.1**	1.14	179159	1773	61.8	0.40	178981	1685	143	0.00	136551	0	143	0.00	136551	0
200_10_135_9_D6	190.9	7.53	103411	2442	**186.8**	2.40	104042	2117	268	2.69	71986	0	268.7	1.73	71986	0
200_10_50_15	**63.4**	1.43	188265	2814	63.8	1.08	189963	2903	167	0.00	84308	0	167	0.00	84308	0
200_10_50_9	**64**	0.77	250681	2505	64.8	0.40	249281	1911	318	0.00	**105198**	1	317.6	1.20	105217	57
200_10_84_9	67.9	0.83	224551	1907	**67.4**	1.02	224596	1505	318	0.60	117549	19	318	0.00	**117543**	0
200_10_85_15	**62.9**	0.83	303381	2050	63.2	0.60	303335	2961	215	0.00	195820	0	215	0.00	195820	0
200_20_145_15	36.6	0.80	275546	3066	**36.5**	0.67	277057	3948	158	0.00	143507	16	158	0.00	**143497**	0
200_20_150_9_D5	191.6	2.29	90882	3176	**184.8**	5.02	92562	1457	318	16.31	51678	74	345.9	1.45	**51497**	2
200_20_54_15	**36.7**	1.42	295455	2829	37.5	0.92	293412	3656	125	0.30	161424	25	125	0.00	**161412**	0
200_20_55_9	**37**	1.00	229781	4000	37.7	0.78	228500	5602	310	8.83	71652	483	328	4.96	**70154**	92
200_20_97_15	42	0.00	287989	4572	**42**	0.00	285854	5826	171	0.00	156951	0	171	0.00	156951	0
200_20_97_9	**37.3**	1.19	275710	4650	37.6	0.80	276680	5627	152	5.81	100450	1414	168.7	0.64	**98500**	43
200_40_130_9_D4	108	0.00	103493	2383	**108**	0.00	103389	1692	219	4.93	48022	533	216.1	0.94	**46663**	329
200_40_133_15	25.4	0.66	280950	4927	**25.4**	0.66	279931	3980	138	4.12	98962	585	145.3	3.47	**97396**	72
200_40_45_15	**23.6**	0.80	256232	3997	24.2	0.60	256521	3155	198	3.93	91369	970	212.3	1.49	**87974**	31
200_40_45_9	**26**	0.63	271406	4939	26.4	0.49	267745	7041	266	10.32	93099	2528	301.5	9.74	**83744**	1500
200_40_90_9	**25.4**	0.80	292674	8765	26	0.63	291293	5745	219	10.62	97899	3623	250.6	10.04	**85915**	1533
200_40_91_15	**23.7**	0.64	246065	3201	24.1	0.54	248715	6059	164	7.56	89262	810	178.6	5.62	**86590**	133

To determine the best obtained result for BO mode, neither duration nor cost has been investigated. Instead of those aspects, the evaluation function value has been taken into account. Furthermore, we were not able to compare strictly the results of BO for ACO with corresponding ones for heuristics, as no evaluation function has been used to evaluate results of heuristics.

A similar analysis has been made for the best found results within investigated hybrid. The best HAntCO results have been presented in Tab. 3. The most significant difference for HAntCO best results table in comparison with table of best results for classical ACO is that there is no BO mode included. It is because hybrid is activated only for DO or CO mode – depending on selected heuristic for initialization.

Taking into account the results gathered in Tab. 3, we can assume that the ELITE strategy mode for HAntCO generally provides better results than DIFF in DO mode. It provided better results in 26 cases (72%). However, in CO we noticed that the DIFF strategy turned out to be more suitable than the ELITE, provided better results in 9 cases (25%), while the ELITE became better in only one case (less than 3%). In remaining cases, both strategies gave the same best results. An interesting fact is that for DO no equal best results for both strategies have been found.

Also comparing HAntCO best results (see Tab. 3) to single heuristics results (see. Tab 2) we can see that hybrid ACO with heuristics is more effective for DO than CO mode. In most instances (89%) HAntCO found a better solution than simple heuristic or ACO.

5.3.2 Averaged results

Averaged results obtained for various pheromone update methods have been presented in Tab. 4 in a similar way as the ones in Tab. 2 respectively. We also provided in Tab. 4 the notation for the method that provided best results (A, D, E, D/E). In opposition to Tab. 2 no comparison to averaged heuristic results has been introduced, because heuristics are deterministic methods for which result can be obtained in only one iteration. On the other hand, in Tab. 4 a standard deviation measure (σ) has been introduced, to indicate the level of variability of the obtained results. It is presented as a percentage value of an average.

For DO and CO modes the smallest averaged values of project duration or project cost respectively have been taken into account to determine the best pheromone update method. If values of given aspect are equal, the smallest value of the second aspect is taken into account. If there is still no possibility to determine which pheromone update method provides better solutions, the standard deviation of more important aspect is taken into account (duration for DO and cost for CO respectively) and the method with smaller standard deviation value is regarded as better.

We have also provided averaged results for HAntCO approach, presented in Tab. 5. Analogously to best HAntCO approach results, averaged ones regard only DO and CO modes. Averaged values are supported by standard deviation values that reflect the variability of the obtained results. We have also decided to count how

many times one strategy became better than another also in averaged results. For DO, ELITE strategy became better in 25 cases (69%), while DIFF became better in the remaining ones. For CO, DIFF strategy provided better results in 14 cases (39%), while only in one case ELITE strategy became better. For the remaining ones, the obtained averaged results became the same. It leads to conclusion that HAntCO searches space in CO mode in very directed way, being unable to explore other parts of the solution space. Independent character of searching is, in many cases, regardless of applied pheromone update strategy.

To investigate the level of stability of HAntCO in comparison with classical ACO, we have checked how many times 0–equal standard deviation value has been obtained in the conducted experiments. Those results are presented in Tab. 6. The results gathered in this table prove that the proposed hybrid approach is more directed and thus, the proposed approach found the same solution in many more cases than classical ACO which stochastic nature allows to explore the search space more widely.

Table 6 Number of 0–equal standard deviation measures for given pheromone update strategies and optimization modes.

Method	ELITE				DIFF			
	DO		CO		DO		CO	
	Days	Cost	Days	Cost	Days	Cost	Days	Cost
ACO	3	0	5	4	3	0	4	1
HAntCO	2	0	24	21	3	0	25	16

The most interesting results found in Tab. 6 concern CO mode. For that mode, HAntCO found the same cost solutions 21 (58%) times for ELITE and 16 times (44%) for DIFF strategies, while the same duration solutions have been found 24 (67%) and 25 (69%) times respectively.

5.4 Computational complexity

Our research has been extended by investigating the level of complexity of compared methods. The complexity has been estimated as a number of potential assignments of resources to a given task as dominant operations. As this value is constant regardless of the optimization process and depends only on initial skill constraints, we can compute the level of complexity as a factor of an average number of iterations and a number of possible assignments. The results of those computations are presented in Tab. 7.

As we decided to set a constant number of iterations in most methods like TS, EA S and EA C, the complexity level for those methods was easy to compute. For ACO and HAntCO we decided to get an average number of iterations from all optimization modes (DO, BO, CO) and update pheromone methods (ALL, ELITE, DIFF) as the value that should be multiplied by a number of possible assignments.

Table 7 Average number of dominant operations (divided by 10^3) during optimization process using investigated methods for given parameters' configurations

	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6
TS	200.3	38.3	22.7	234.5	159.6	72.0
EA C	80.3	38,3	22.7	234.5	159.6	72.0
ACO	1287.9	472.8	205.9	3038.4	2221.4	1063.4
HAntCO	423.9	212.5	86.2	1925.5	1481.2	323.3
H	0.803	0.383	0.227	2.345	1.596	0.72

Based on the results gathered in Tab.7 we can notice that ACO and HAntCO are most processing–complex methods. However, the level of complexity for HAntCO is lower than for classical ACO. It is because the number of iterations for hybrids is generally smaller, as searching is started from more directed place in the solution space.

Complexity level of heuristics has been computed as multiplication of a number of possible assignments by 1, as there is only one iteration in heuristic scheduling process. What is more, heuristic are deterministic approaches. Therefore, we always get the same results that are obtained in only one iteration. Hence, heuristic could be used as a powerful tool to get the first glance of optimization possibilities for given dataset instance.

5.5 Results' discussion

Both for the best and averaged results for classical ACO, ELITE update pheromone method turned out to be the best for DO mode, while DIFF update pheromone method became the most suitable for BO mode. However it is not possible to get such straightforward conclusions for CO mode, because DIFF method became the most suitable choice for the best obtained results while both DIFF and ELITE methods provided equally good results for average obtained optimization results.

We have also compared pheromone update methods in hybrids performance. For that approach ELITE mode turned out to be the most suitable for DO, while any ($*$) proposed pheromone update method became equally good for CO mode for most project instances. No difference between pheromone update method has been also observed in 15/36 (42%) cases in CO. It could lead to conclusion that pheromone update method is not as crucial as for classical ACO. It is because initial solution is preferred – hybrid is more exploitation– than exploration–oriented.

We have also compared how many times heuristics provided better results than the best ones obtained

from an application of ACO approaches (see Tab. 2). For DO, SLS heuristic became better 9 times (25%), while for CO SA or RS heuristics became better 18 times (50%). It shows that classical ACO approach, proposed in this paper cannot be fully regarded as better in comparison with heuristic methods. However, combining it with heuristic in hybrid (HAntCO) approach turned out to give usually much better results than any other investigated methods, especially for CO mode.

An interesting fact is that DO mode is generally more stable than other based on the provided results. It has been deducted by counting number of bigger than 10% σ values in Tab. 4. For DO there were no such values, while, for BO, there were 3 over 10% values (2 for duration aspect and 1 for a cost aspect). Finally, for CO, there were 7 over 10% values of standard deviation – all for a duration aspect.

An interesting conclusion that could be made regardless of the best or averaged results is that a DIFF strategy provided better solutions in DO mode but mostly for dataset instances containing 200 tasks. The best results obtained by a DIFF strategy were better than obtained by an ELITE in 9 cases for 200 task–project instances (50%), while ELITE strategy provided only one better solution than a DIFF (5%). Averaged results obtained in a DIFF mode were better in 12 cases (67%), while ELITE strategy still provided only one better solution in comparison with a DIFF.

Comparing the best results obtained by ACO and HAnt-CO it can be noticed that HAntCO outclasses classical ACO, whichever pheromone update method would be used. For DO, classical ACO approach has been better than HAntCO in only 5 from 36 cases, while for CO HAntCO became better than ACO for every project instance. Analysing averaged results, there are only 3 cases with ACO results better than HAntCO ones. Still only for DO. For CO, ACO has never been better than HAntCO. It proves the legitimacy of using hybrids that become robust way of boosting optimization process.

To get bigger awareness of classical ACO and HAnt-CO approaches' robustness, we decided to compare the obtained best results for ACO with best results obtained using other methods, as EA (Skowroński et al., 2013a) and TS (Myszkowski et al., 2013). However, we needed to distinguish the best results obtained for DO and CO modes from BO mode, because no heuristic scheduling method has been proposed for BO. Comparison of DO, BO and CO modes has been presented in Tab. 8.

This comparison has been made only for project instances D1–D6, because only those have been investigated in (Skowroński et al., 2013a), (Myszkowski et al., 2013) and (Skowroński et al., 2013b). The compared methods are Taboo Search (TS), specialized Evolutionary Algorithms (EA S), classic EA (EA C), classical ACO, HAntCO and heuristics (H).

The results presented in Tab. 8 show that both HAnt-CO and TS outclassed other methods in DO mode, obtaining best cost results for half of investigated project instances for each method (D1, D2, D5, D6 for HAntCO and D3, D4 for TS). For CO mode, classical ACO became the best approach for D2 and D3 instances, while HAntCO obtained the best results for the same instances plus D1. However, the most successful approach for these instances is a heuristic one that allowed to get best results in 5/6 cases.

The averaged results of investigated methods are presented in Tab.9. It differs slightly from the results in Tab.8, as methods are non–deterministic. However, conclusions are very similar: HAntCO outperforms other methods in almost every case or results are comparable. We developed extra statistical analysis to prove a quality of presented method. We have provided the Kolmogorov–Smirnov (K–S test) to investigate the normality of the distribution of gained results. The K–S test proved that results of used methods are normally distributed and t–test can be used. Moreover, a sample size around 50 allows the normality assumptions conducive for performing the unpaired t-tests (Flury, 1997). We used two tailed t–test with 95% confidence interval (see results in Tab.10) for the best and the second best performing methods applied in D1–D6 instances for DO and CO modes.

We found that HAntCO results are the best in most cases. Very interesting results are noticed for EA S, especially for D5 instance (in DO and CO mode) where EA S gives the best (average) solutions. Only in one case (D3 instance DO mode) ACO gives better average solution. The results are significant in statistical meaning. The statistical significance of results for HAntCO in CO mode comes mostly from the fact that HAntCO is a method directed by a heuristic that finds the best cost–oriented solution (algorithm). Hence, the statistical significance of this method should be mostly investigated in DO mode. In this mode, the results obtained by HAntCO are statistically significant in 3 cases (D1, D2, D6), while DO–oriented results obtained by ACO are statistically significant in only one case (D3). It additionally proves the legitimacy of using proposed hybrid rather than classical ACO approach. We have also investigated results for several methods in BO mode. In this case, classical ACO approach outclassed the rest of examined methods and became the best choice in 5/6 cases. However, it caused enlarging the project schedule duration of analysed instances and make them mostly

Table 8 Comparison of best obtained results for investigated methods in DO, BO and CO modes

Method	Mode	Crit.	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6
TS	DO	days	32	33	51	**92**	179	199
		cost	40656	43542	40054	88720	80448	97978
	BO	days	37	49	61	125	184	222
		cost	38939	34240	36100	50438	54181	75996
	CO	days	129	179	133	254	481	330
		cost	30750	26444	31645	46371	52425	73126
EA S	DO	days	32	34	52	112	179	216
		cost	41509	42804	40768	66196	90753	81344
	BO	days	32	40	57	112	188	216
		cost	42975	40387	38486	87107	84067	88317
	CO	days	116	133	163	196	417	294
		cost	30158	26691	34361	52027	52400	74897
EA C	DO	days	35	52	64	112	183	216
		cost	41217	37248	40242	87487	81555	99462
	BO	days	46	77	77	114	211	216
		cost	37190	31888	35527	79854	72918	92602
	CO	days	56	94	84	120	230	216
		cost	35760	31328	34160	78928	72338	91972
ACO	DO	days	32	34	**50**	112	186	216
		cost	52119	44999	41029	94488	91461	99375
	BO	days	60	72	75	132	247	237
		cost	30900	27120	31681	48362	52620	72753
	CO	days	121	129	167	205	296	274
		cost	30107	**26323**	**30164**	48419	51678	72036
HAntCO	DO	days	**23**	**33**	53	108	**177**	**186**
		cost	53358	42199	40811	104965	92567	103561
	CO	days	117	129	167	216	344	267
		cost	**30104**	**26323**	**30164**	46342	51496	71986
H	DO	days	32	38	57	112	183	216
		cost	53154	44309	40539	101879	92821	105593
	CO	days	119	129	167	214	337	256
		cost	30104	**26323**	**30164**	**46133**	**51496**	**71986**

Table 9 Comparison of averaged obtained results for investigated methods in DO and CO modes

Method	Mode	Crit.	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6
TS	DO	days	35.06±2.26	46.14±3.06	71.0±0.0	112±0.0	183.0±0.0	216.0±0.0
		cost	41151±201	38205±950	38748±0.0	87691±206	79927±166	98538±138
	CO	days	128±4.99	176.7±11.6	133.4±4.4	248.3±21.4	467.3±23.7	358.2±17.2
		cost	30693±2.1	26424±3.4	31637±0.0	46359±128	52354±43	72961±0.0
EA S	DO	days	32±0.00	37.52±1.28	54.68±1.39	112±0.00	**180±1.51**	216±0.00
		cost	52781±1510	43547±909	41082±544	104459±4194	92355±3234	100002±4511
	CO	days	43.9±7.64	150 ±3.09	110.7±10	234.66±20.4	443.8±25.8	221.6.5±10.88
		cost	46492±673	26344±57	34834±535	47600±509	**51200±220**	93914±957
EA C	DO	days	32.0±0.00	46.6±2.27	68.32±1.72	111.88±0.72	181.2±1.48	216.0±0.00
		cost	52949±1850	43113±1139	41026±927	107021±2955	87899±2687	101798±1894
	CO	days	46.43±5.84	76.45±7.29	114.2±12.11	116.5±5.9	206.36±12.07	219.34.7±6.97
		cost	45220±902	36678±656	34074±521	94577±1586	77804±1228	94218±852
ACO	DO	days	32±0.0	38.4±1.49	**52.86±1.6**	112±0.0	189.8±2.5	216.24±0.72
		cost	53092±1816	43271±895	53092±1816	104862±2928	90471±2765	102075±1930
	CO	days	114.06±7.29	127.5±6.5	166.82±0.38	181.52±12.62	252.9±11.93	260.35±8.27
		cost	30295±332	26376±154	30167±7.21	50486±1113	53110±584	72767±1566
HAntCO	DO	days	**25.1±0.81**	**35.8±1.07**	55.8±0.73	**108.0±0.00**	182.48±5.05	**186.8±2.16**
		cost	53527±1086	44183±622	56671±314	104112±2217	90294±3198	104510±1690
	CO	days	117.0±0.00	128.98±0.13	167.0±0.00	217.1±1.07	341.62±8.02	267.36±1.94
		cost	**30104±0.0**	**26323±3.78**	**30164±0**	46554±291	51514±	**71986±0.00**
H	DO	days	32±0	38±0	57±0	112±0	183±0	216±0
		cost	53154±0	44309±0	40539±0	101879±0	92821±0	105593±40
	CO	days	119±0	129±0	167±0	214±0	337±0	256±0
		cost	**30104±0**	**26323±0**	**30164±0**	**46133±0**	51496±0	**71986±0**

Table 10 Results of the unpaired t-test between the best and the second best performing methods (for each instances D1-D6) based on Tab.9 (heuristic H (Skowroński et al., 2013b) results not included as a part of HAntCO)

instance	mode	best methods	std.error	t	95% conf. inter.	two tailed p	stat. significance
D1	DO	**HAntCO**, EA S	0.115	60.2350	-7.12 to -6.67	< 0.0001	**extr. significant**
	CO	**HAntCO**, EA S	47.016	4.0574	-284.06 to -97.45	< 0.0001	**extr. significant**
D2	DO	**HAntCO**, EA S	8.072	7.2901	-2.18 to -1.25	< 0.0001	**extr. significant**
	CO	**HAntCO**, TS	0.726	2.6885	-37.71 to -5.68	0.0084	**very significant**
D3	DO	**ACO**, EA S	0.300	6.0720	-2.41 to -1.22	< 0.0001	**extr. significant**
	CO	**HAntCO**, **ACO**	1.018	3.5355	1.57 to 5.62	0.0006	**extr. significant**
D4	DO	**HAntCO**, EA C	0.102	38.1052	3.67 to 4.08	< 0.0001	**extr. significant**
	CO	TS, **HAntCO**	44.934	4.3397	-284.16 to -105.83	< 0.0001	**extr. significant**
D5	DO	EA S, EA C	0.299	2.8761	-1.45 to -0.26	0.0049	**very significant**
	CO	EA S, **HAntCO**	31.673	9.8913	-376.14 to -250.43	< 0.0001	**extr. significant**
D6	DO	**HAntCO**, TS, EA	0.305	95.8523	28.67 to 29.88	< 0.0001	**extr. significant**
	CO	**HAntCO**, **ACO**	221.542	3.5243	341.14 to 1220.43	0.0006	**extr. significant**

the longest from all obtained with various methods. EA with specialized genetic operators gave the smallest project cost for BO mode. It was the best in 5/6 cases. An interesting fact is that the results obtained for ACO are completely different from the results from other methods like TS or EA. The conclusion could be that ACO searches the solution space totally different from the above–mentioned methods. Hence combining those approaches into one could be possibly effective and potentially give promising results.

6 Conclusions and further work

In this paper we have presented hybrid approach for solving Multi–Skill Resource–Constrained Project Scheduling Problem. MS–RCPSP is an extension of classical RCPSP with skills and cost domain. Our approach bases on classical ACO metaheuristics for discrete combinatorial problems. However, it has been enhanced by modified pheromone update methods. Furthermore, we have proposed a hybridization of ACO approach (HAnt-CO) by using simple heuristics based on priority rules to find an initial solution in optimization process.

What is more, we have prepared and published iMOPSE dataset instances to allow others to investigate their approaches for such defined MS–RCPSP. The dataset consists of 36 instances containing 100 or 200 tasks. All instances are varied by the number of resources, precedence relations and skill types what makes them more or less difficult to be scheduled.

We have also defined evaluation methods for the proposed approaches not only in case of their robustness (how good the final solution is) but also their effectiveness. To evaluate method's quality, we rate not only the project schedule duration, as in classical RCPSP, but also the project schedule performance cost, regarding the MS–RCPSP as multi–objective optimization problem. The method's effectiveness is rated by the number of dominant operations that need to be performed during the optimization process.

Finally, we have compared the results obtained by HAnt-CO and ACO with the ones received with the use of other methods as simple heuristics, Taboo Search and Evolutionary Algorithms with classic and specialized genetic operators that have been published before. The provided results have been also supported by the statistical significance tests. The obtained results lead to the conclusion that ACO–based approaches stand suitable ones for solving MS–RCPSP as they provide mostly the best results from all investigated methods.

6.1 Future work

After observation that pheromone update method in ACO has an impact on the obtained results depending on selected optimization mode (aspect), we are encouraged to use this outcome and propose an approach more dedicated to multi–objective optimization using Pareto front from various ant populations performing in different pheromone update methods. It could provide us a mechanism to find very good solutions leaving the need of setting optimization mode. It could give us good solutions in DO and BO in the same run of ACO–based run.

Pareto–based approach could be implemented in the investigated methods to distinguish non–dominated solutions. By non–dominated solution a one with the smallest value of given criterion is taken while remaining criterion values are equal. In MS–RCPSP non–dominated solution is regarded as the one that has smallest cost or duration from subset of solutions with the same duration or cost respectively. It could make the optimization process more robust and effective, as *good enough* results could be found in a smaller number of iterations within the examined method.

As cost oriented optimization in ACO and HAntCO has not provided significantly better results than other methods investigated in this paper, we discuss a potential application of dedicated neighbourhood definition for ants to make them more oriented to search solutions cheaper.

Investigating the comparison of the results obtained for CO and DO modes could lead to conclusion that ACO is a powerful tool for solving MS–RCPSP, especially if it was boosted by initial solution obtained by heuristic (HAntCO). It leads to conclusion that other hybrids should be investigated using the proposed heuristics. Hence we would examine and compare the results obtained for EA, TS or SA approaches to check, whether boosting initial solution by heuristic provides better results for other metaheuristics.

According to the experiences with ACO of other researchers, ACO can be extended by additional heuristic (Dorigo, 1997) to enhance the potential of optimization. We plan to find suitable, problem specific heuristic that could be used and investigate whether it could make our approach better in solving MS–RCPSP.

References

Al–Anzi F.S., Al–Zamel K., Allahverdi A.; Weighted Multi–Skill Resources Project Scheduling, J. of Software Engineering & Applications (3), pp. 1125–1130, 2010.

Blazewicz J., Lenstra J.K., Rinnooy Kan A.H.G.; Scheduling subject to resource constraints: Classification and complexity, Discrete Applied Mathematics (5), pp. 11-24, 1983.

Bianco L., DellOlmo P., Speranza M.G.; Heuristics for multimode scheduling problems with dedicated resources, Eu. J. of Oper. Research (107), pp. 260-271, 1998.

Bouleimen K., Lecocq H.; A new efficient simulated annealing algorithm for the resource-constrained project scheduling problem and its multiple mode version, Eu. J. of Oper. Research (149), pp. 268-281, 2003.

Brucker P., Drexl A., Mohring R., Neumann K., Pesch E.; Resource–constrained project scheduling: Notation, classification, models, and methods, Eu. J. of Oper. Research (112), pp. 3–41, 1998.

Das P. P., Acharyya S.; Simulated Annealing Variants for Solving Resource Constrained Project Scheduling Problem: A Comparative Study, Proceedings of 14th Int. Conf. on Computer and Information Technology, pp. 469–474, 2011.

Dorigo M.; Ant Colony System: A Cooperative Learning Approach to the Traveling Salesman Problem, IEEE Trans. of Evolutionary Computation (1/1), pp. 53-66, 1997.

Drezet L.E., Billaut J.C.; A project scheduling problem with labour constraints and time–dependent activities requirements, Int. J. of Production Economics (112), pp. 217-225, 2008.

Flury B., A First Course in Multivariate Statistics, Vol.28. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 1997

Gonzalez F., Ramies Rios D., Multi–objective Optimization of the Resource Constrained Project Scheduling Problem (RCPSP) A heuristic approach based on the mathematical model, The Int. J. of Computer Science & Applications (TIJCSA) (2/2), pp. 1–13, 2013.

Hartmann S.; A competitive genetic algorithm for resource–constrained project scheduling, Naval Research Logistics (45), pp. 733–750, 1998.

Hegazy T., Shabeeb A.K., Elbeltagi E., Cheema T.; Algorithm for scheduling with multiskilled constrained resources, J. of Construction Engineering and Management (11-12/2000), pp. 414–421, 2000.

Jaberi M., Jaberi M.; A Multi–objective Resource–Constrained Project–Scheduling Problem Using Mean Field Annealing Neural Networks, J. of Mathematics and Computer science (9), pp. 228–239, 2014.

Kadrou Y., Najid N.M.; A new heuristic to solve RCPSP with multiple execution modes and Multi–Skilled Labor, IMACS Multiconf. on Computational Engineering in Systems Applications (CESA), pp. 1302–1309, 2006.

Kolisch R., Sprecher A., PSPLIB - A project scheduling problem library, Eu. J. of Oper. Research (96), pp. 205–216, 1996.

Kolisch R., Hartmann S., Experimental evaluation of state-of-the-art heuristics for the resource-constrained project scheduling problem, Eu. J. of Oper. Research (127), pp. 394–407, 2000.

Kolisch R., Hartmann S., Experimental investigation of heuristics for resource-constrained project scheduling: An update, Eu. J. of Oper. Research (174), pp. 23-37, 2006.

Li H., Womer K.; Scheduling projects with multi-skilled personnel by a hybrid MILP/CP benders decomposition algorithm, J. of Scheduling, (12), pp. 281-298, 2009.

Liang Y., Chen A., Kao W., Chyu C.; An Ant Colony approach to Resource–Constrained Project Scheduling Problems, Proceedings of the Fifth Asia Pacific Industrial Engineering and Management Systems Conference 2004, pp. 31.5.1-31.5.10, 2004.

Luna F., Gonzalez–Alvarez D. L., Chicano F., Vega–Rodriguez M.A.; The software project scheduling problem: A scalability analysis of multi–objective

metaheuristics, Applied Soft Computing, 2013.

Luo S., Wang C., Wang J.; Ant Colony Optimization for Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling with Generalized Precedence Relations, Proceedings of the 15th IEEE Int. Conf. on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI03), pp. 284–289, 2003.

Merkle D., Mittendorf M., Schmeck H.; Ant Colony Optimization for Resource–Constrained Project Scheduling, IEEE Trans. on Evolutionary Computation (6/4), pp. 333–346, 2002.

Pan H.I., Hsaio P.W., Chen K.Y.; A study of project scheduling optimization using Tabu Search algorithm, Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence (21), pp. 1101-1112, 2008.

Pan N.H., Lee M.L., Chen K.Y.; Improved Tabu Search Algorithm Application in RCPSP, Proceedings of the Int. Multiconf. of Engineers and Computer Scientists (Vol I), 2009.

Phruksaphanrat B.; Multi–Objective Multi–Mode Resource–Constrained Project Scheduling Problem by Preemptive Fuzzy Goal Programming, World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, Int. J. of Mechanical, Industrial Science and Engineering (8/3), pp. 99–103, 2014

Santos M., Tereso A. P.; On the multi-mode, multi-skill resource constrained project scheduling problem - computational results, Soft Computing in Industrial Applications, Advances in Intelligent and Soft Computing (96), pp. 239–248, 2011.

Skowroński M. E., Myszkowski P. B., Specialized genetic operators for Multi-Skill Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, 19th Int. Conf. on Soft Computing Mendel 2013, pp. 57-62, 2013.

Skowroński M. E., Myszkowski P. B., Kwiatek P., Adamski M., Tabu Search approach for Multi-Skill Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, Annals of Comp. Sci. and Information Systems Vol.1, Proc. of the 2013 FedCSIS, pp. 153-158, 2013.

Skowroński M. E., Myszkowski P. B., Podlodowski Ł., Novel heuristic solutions for Multi-Skill Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, Annals of Comp. Sci. and Information Systems Vol. 1, Proc. of the 2013 FedCSIS, pp. 159-166, 2013.

Stutzle T., Hoos H.; Max–Min Ant System, Future Generation Computer Systems (16), pp.889-914, 2000.

Thomas P. R., Salhi S.; A Tabu Search Approach for the Resource Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, Journal of Heuristics (4), pp. 123-139, 1998.

Tsai Y.W., Gemmill D. D.; Using tabu search to schedule activities of stochastic resource–constrained projects, Eu. J. of Operational Research (111), pp. 129–141, 1998.

Valls V., Ballestin F., Quintanilla S.; A hybrid genetic algorithm for the resource–constrained project scheduling problem, Eu. J. of Operational Research (185), pp. 495-508, 2008.

Valls V., Ballestin F., Quinanilla S.; An Evolutionary Approach to the Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, MIC2001 - 4th Metaheuristics Int. Conf., pp. 217–220, 2001.

Verhoeven M. G. A.; Tabu search for resource-constrained scheduling, Eu. J. of Operational Research (106), pp. 266–276, 1998.

Wang H., Lin D., Li M.Q.; A competitive genetic algorithm for Resource–Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, Proceedings of the Fourth Int. Conf. on Machine Learning and Cybernetics, pp. 2945–2949, 2005.

Watson J., Ross C., Eisele V., Denton J., Bins J., Guerra C., Whitley D., Howe A.; The Traveling Salesrep Problem, Edge Assembly Crossover, and 2-opt, Lecture Notes in Computer Science (1498), pp 823–832, 1998.

Yannibelli V., Amandi A.; Hybridizing a multi–objective simulated annealing algorithm with a multi–objective evolutionary algorithm to solve a multi–objective project scheduling problem, Expert Systems with Applications (40), pp. 2421-2434, 2013.

Zhang H., Xu H., Peng W., A Genetic Algorithm for Solving RCPSP, 2008 Int. Symposium on Computer Science and Computational Technology, pp. 246–249, 2008.

Zhang H., Li H., Tam C.; Particle swarm optimization for resource–constrained project scheduling, Int. J. of Project Management (24), pp. 83-92, 2006.

Zhang H., Li X., Li H., Hang F.; Particle swarm optimization-based schemes for resource-constrained project scheduling, Automation in Construction (14), pp. 393-404, 2005.

Zhang K., Zhao G., Jiang J.; Particle Swarm Optimization Method for Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, The Ninth Int. Conf. on Electronic Measurement & Instruments ICEMI2009, pp. 792–796, 2009.

Zhou Y., Guo Q., Gan R.; Improved ACO Algorithm for Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, 2009 Int. Conf. on Artificial Intelligence and Computational Intelligence, pp. 358–365, 2009.

Zhou L., Wang D., Peng W., An ACO for Solving RCPSP, 2008 Inter. Symposium on Computer Science and Comp. Technology, pp. 250-253, 2008.

Ziarati K., Akbari R., Zeighami V.; On the performance of bee algorithms for resource–constrained project scheduling problem, Applied Soft Computing (11), pp. 3720–3733, 2011.